



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

15

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,910	08/02/2001	Miraj Mostafa	442-010509-US(PAR)	7123
2512	7590	12/21/2005		EXAMINER
PERMAN & GREEN				MEUCCI, MICHAEL D
425 POST ROAD				
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/920,910	MOSTAFA, MIRAJ	
	Examiner Michael D. Meucci	Art Unit 2142	
<p><b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b></p> <p>THE REPLY FILED <u>30 November 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p> <p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than <u>SIX MONTHS</u> from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p> <p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p> <p><b>NOTICE OF APPEAL</b></p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>      </u>. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p> <p><b>AMENDMENTS</b></p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>      </u>. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of claims 47 and 59</u>.</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>      </u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>21-59</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-20</u>.</p> <p><b>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</b></p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p> <p><b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</b></p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>      </u></p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>      </u>.</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 50px;"></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>ANDREW CALDWELL</b> <b>SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER</b></p>			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner maintains the prior art rejections from the Final Action mailed 7/26/05. Examiner acknowledges amendment made to overcome objections to claims 45-46. These objections have been withdrawn. Examiner acknowledges amendments made to overcome 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections to claims 47 and 59. These rejections have been withdrawn.

Applicant contends that Luzeski, Parasn, and Broussard fail to disclose any aspect of the streamable media component. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Luzeski teaches streaming media throughout its disclosure (see particularly lines 49-53 of column 3 for receiving at the server; lines 35-39 of column 11 for sending descriptive information; and ). The media must be streamed because in any data that is transmitted, streaming is inherent. The claims do not specify streaming as being performed in real-time. As such, transmitting data to the mail server is considered streaming data. Session based communication is taught by Parasn on lines 35-42 of column 2 as disclosed in the previous office action. Examiner respectfully points out to the applicant that the type of data being "streamed" in Parasn is not at issue. In Parasn, the sending computer is considered the source messaging server. As such, Parasn teaches forming a streaming session between the messaging server and the recipient terminal. Applicant also contends that Broussard does not teach the limitations that Luzeski and Broussard leave out. The only limitation Broussard is relied upon in reference to applicant's arguments is the recipient terminal being wireless. Proper citation and motivation for combining this aspect has been provided in the previous office action. As such, all of the limitations of the claims have been taught by Luzeski in combination with Parasn and Broussard.